

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/657,411	09/08/2003	Dieter Mauer	0275M-000768	9939	
27572 7	590 03/25/2005		EXAMINER		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			BRYANT, DAVID P		
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELI	O HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2230112122			3726		

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

						797'		
		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/657,	411	MAUER ET AL.				
		Examin	er	Art Unit				
		David P	. Bryant	3726				
Ti Period for R	ne MAILING DATE of this commur	nication appears on t	he cover sheet with	the correspondence ad	dress			
A SHOR THE MAI - Extensions after SIX ( - If the period - If NO period - Failure to Any reply	FENED STATUTORY PERIOD F LING DATE OF THIS COMMUN s of time may be available under the provisions 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm of for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 of for reply is specified above, the maximum st reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three months tent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a repl tatutory minimum of thirty ( will expire SIX (6) MONTH pplication to become ABAN	y be timely filed  30) days will be considered timel IS from the mailing date of this co				
Status								
1)⊠ Re	sponsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>29 December</i>	2004					
′=	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
<i>'</i> —								
clo	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition	of Claims					•		
4a) 5)☐ Cla 6)☐ Cla 7)☐ Cla 8)⊠ Cla	im(s) <u>1-7,9-16,21-40 and 51-76</u> Of the above claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are wi im(s) is/are allowed. im(s) is/are rejected. im(s) is/are objected to. im(s) <u>2-7,9-16,21-40 and 51-76</u> and 51-76 and 5	thdrawn from consid	deration.	n requirement.				
Application	Papers							
·	specification is objected to by th							
	drawing(s) filed on is/are	•				•		
	licant may not request that any obje				-D 4 404(4)			
	lacement drawing sheet(s) including oath or declaration is objected to	•	- · ·	•	` ,			
Priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119	-				3		
_	•	for foreign amority.	do-251100 0 4	40/-) (4) (6)		4		
a)⊡ A 1.⊑ 2.⊑ 3.⊑	_ ' '	documents have be documents have be of the priority documental Bureau (PCT Re	een received. een received in App nents have been re ule 17.2(a)).	olication No ceived in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)			🗖			•		
	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	PTO-948)	4) Interview Sun Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) ⁄lail Date				
3) 🔲 Informatio	n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or s)/Mail Date	-		rmal Patent Application (PTC	<b>⊢152</b> )			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Art Unit: 3726

## Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II (claims 21-40) in the reply filed on December 29, 2004, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that (1) searching and examining all of the alleged groups will not pose an undue burden on the Examiner, and (2) the Examiner has not set forth a *prima facie* case for restriction.

This is not found persuasive because of the following:

- (1) One way to show undue burden on the Examiner is a showing of different classification of subject matter (MPEP §808.02). The different classifications were clearly set forth in the requirement for restriction, and the search required for each of the Groups is not the same search required for the others.
- (2) A prima facie case for restriction was clearly made in the last Office action.

  Distinctness between the inventions was outlined with valid examples, and different classification of subject matter was shown.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

This application, as now amended, contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A: The embodiment depicted in Figures 1-4.

Species B: The embodiment depicted in Figures 5-6.

Species C: The embodiment depicted in Figure 7.

<u>Species D:</u> The embodiment depicted in Figures 8-10.

<u>Species E:</u> The embodiment depicted in Figure 11.

<u>Species F:</u> The embodiment depicted in Figure 12.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, a number of claims appear to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 3726

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David P. Bryant whose telephone number is (571) 272-4526. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> David P. Bryant Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3726